

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
March 25, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on March 25, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – February 19, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the February 19, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU27:** Obtain Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3.
Status: Jim Upholt (DWR) is currently working on obtaining the bicycle plan. The local council of governments (COG) and Rob MacKenzie have been identified as sources of information on this matter.
- Action Item #LU31:** Mail meeting handouts to conference call participants.
Status: The Facilitator mailed handouts from the February Work Group meeting to all conference call participants.
- Action Item #LU32:** Distribute list of available GIS data to the Work Group.
Status: Jim Martin (DWR) brought the list of the available GIS data layers from the Northern District to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting. He identified those participants who would like a copy of the list and will e-mail the list electronically to those participants. Those participants without e-mail will be sent the list by regular mail.
- Action Item #LU33:** Request other RAMs to identify pertinent planning documents that will be considered under SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency).
Status: This item was discussed later in the meeting under Agenda Item V. Jim Martin indicated to the participants that he frequently coordinates with other Resource Area Managers (RAMs) and that there has been discussion on this matter. Please see the meeting summary below for further information.

- Action Item #LU34:** Contact FERC to acquire more details on the potential BLM land transfer in the project area.
- Status: Jim Martin contacted John Cofrancesco at FERC regarding the proposed BLM transfer and learned that these types of land exchanges have occurred before in the context of hydropower relicensing. John further stated that this type of exchange would be relatively easy if the land is within the Project boundary, but may be more complicated if portions of it are located outside the Project boundary. Jim added that the other project RAMs are aware of this issue.
- Action Item #LU35:** Update Work Group on status of BLM land transfer project.
- Status: This item was discussed in the context of Agenda Item IV. Jim Martin provided an update to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on the status of this transfer. Please see the meeting summary below for further information.

Plenary Group Update

The Facilitator provided participants with an update on the status of Plenary Group activities. Overall, the Plenary Group has approved approximately 43 study plans to date, nine more are on the March consent calendar, and an additional nine will be reviewed at their March meeting. Most of the study plans that have not yet been considered are from the Environmental Work Group primarily related to fishery issues. The Fisheries Task Force is working on finalizing their study plans with the goal of submitting them to the Plenary Group in May and June 2002. The Environmental Work Group is also working on the cumulative impacts approach that may require either separate study plans to address cumulative impacts or additional sections to be incorporated within currently proposed study plans. The Facilitator informed the participants that the cumulative impact studies are not considered critical-path, and thus, there is no loss of time with regard to the schedule as the approach is developed. All Land Use study plans have been approved by the Plenary Group and are ready for implementation.

Review Available GIS Data

Jim Martin led a discussion on the available GIS data for the project. Jim Martin has received a substantial amount of data compiled by DWR's Northern District. The list of available GIS data will be mailed to Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group participants. Jim mentioned that several of the data layers are directly related to land use (e.g., County zoning, etc.) and will be very useful in conducting land use studies.

Woody Elliot (DPR) inquired whether this information would be available to DPR and other stakeholders. Jim responded that it is still DWR's intention to post the GIS data on the Internet for use/download by the general public; however, there may be limitations based on file size storage. He told participants that they could request specific data layers directly through the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group; requests should not be made directly to the Northern District. It was noted that additional GIS data would be generated through the relicensing studies. At this point, the level of GIS effort after the project is completed is unknown; Jim Martin will follow-up on this issue.

The Facilitator also informed the participants that there is a complete set of recent aerial photographs available for the project area. Specifics about the format of these aerials were unavailable at the time of the meeting. The participants agreed the data would be especially useful for both the Land Use and Cultural Resources Work Groups.

Update on Proposed BLM Land Transfer Issue

Jim Martin summarized the proposed BLM land transfer to the State. This land transfer of approximately 6,400 acres was originally included in a 1993 BLM planning document. It covers lands both within and outside the Project boundary of varied terrain, with some areas inaccessible

and periodically submerged below the lake level. DPR has been coordinating with BLM on subject acreage for many years. Jim Martin spoke with a BLM representative in Redding on this issue and was told that BLM considers this property surplus land.

It is the intent of DWR to work closely with DPR on this issue. The next step is for DWR representatives to meet with DPR in April to further explore this potential opportunity and discuss alternatives for moving forward. In order to obtain this property, BLM made it clear that the recipient agency would need to conduct all the studies and develop all the documents necessary to satisfy the federal land transfer. There is the potential to fold these requirements into the existing relicensing studies. Depending on the scope of the environmental studies required for the BLM land transfer it maybe possible that these studies would consist largely of reorganizing relicensing study plan-generated information. It should be noted however that this issue is not directly part of the relicensing process; as such, it may be pursued outside the relicensing process. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group will be kept updated on this issue.

One participant inquired about the possibility of obtaining the BLM property and then trading or selling it to acquire other properties that DWR and the community may be more interested in. Jim responded that may be a possibility, but there may be reversion clauses in any legal agreement that would preclude this type of activity. The major foreseeable benefit of this transfer would be the establishment of more uniform management and enforcement activities in the project area since project lands would primarily be owned by the State. The participants were informed that Native American applicants may currently be second in line, behind DPR, with an interest to acquire this property from BLM.

One participant asked if there are any existing issues with private in-holdings in the FERC Project boundary. Jim stated that there is very little if any private property within the boundary. The Facilitator added that FERC expects a licensee to retain sufficient control over any private properties to maintain adequate operation of the hydroelectric project.

Consistency Plan Review (data collection efforts from other RAMs)

Jim Martin explained that he frequently coordinates with other Resource Area Managers (RAMs) on various topics and has initiated inquiries regarding planning documents that they might be aware of. Once SP-L3 begins, Mark Greenig (consulting team) and Jim Martin will coordinate the task of identifying and reviewing existing management plans with the other RAMs. Mark Greenig informed the participants that they would take the lead on researching applicable land use plans, while other work groups would identify comprehensive plans related to their discipline and provide brief summaries of the plans and an evaluation of how relicensing correlates with that plan.

The need to coordinate with other work groups to avoid duplicating work was identified as a priority for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. It should be noted however, that there might be different levels of detail required by different work groups on the same issue. As such, coordination between work groups is critical. Mark Greenig has identified proposed studies that the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group needs to coordinate/exchange information with other work groups and based on the upcoming proposed fieldwork schedule, this coordination needs to occur as soon as possible.

One participant asked if SP-L5 would look at the relationship between fuel load management and water quantity. The Facilitator reminded the group that this subject was raised and addressed at the February Plenary Group Meeting and determined to be out of the scope of the relicensing process.

Key Observation Points Identification

Mark Greenig led a discussion on identifying key observation points (KOPs) for the project as needed for SP-L4. Josh Teigiser with the consulting team was introduced at the meeting and will

be assisting Mark on SP-L4. Mark reminded the participants that the identification of KOPs is not a FERC requirement the KOPs would assist an assessment of visual effects. KOPs are intended to portray representative views of the project area. Typically, identified KOPs will be photographed at different pool elevations and seasons to observe the project facility aesthetics under various settings.

Mark developed a preliminary list of KOPs in the project area and asked the participants for their participation in a brainstorming and participation exercise to help identify appropriate KOP locations. The participants indicated locations they feel should be considered on a large map of the study area. Mark explained that they would like to identify several dozen and then visit the locations to make a final list of about 20 KOPS to be used for the study. Participants were encouraged to think about any additional suitable KOP locations and either provide them to Mark or Jim Martin or bring them to the next Work Group meeting.

Next Meetings and Next Steps

The next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Monday, April 22, 2002
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville

The participants changed the meeting location from Sacramento to Oroville and the time from daytime to evening since the Plenary Group meeting is the following day.

Agreements Made

1. The Work Group agreed to hold the next Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics meeting (April 2002) in Oroville, rather than in Sacramento as indicated in the master meeting schedule and during the evening rather than the daytime.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #LU27: Obtain Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: April 22, 2002

Action Item #LU32: Distribute list of available GIS data to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group.
Responsible: DWR
Due Date: April 22, 2002

Action Item #LU36: Research the expected fate of GIS effort after the relicensing process is complete.
Responsible: DWR staff
Due Date: April 22, 2002

Action Item #LU37: Distribute initial list of key observation points (KOPs) to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group.
Responsible: Consulting Team
Due Date: April 22, 2002